DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 784 JC 750 138

AUTHOR Dumont, Richard G.
TITLE Survey of Institutional Goals: Summary Report.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Alfred. Agricultural and Technical Coll.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 37p.; Figure 1 (following Table 1b) is copyrighted and therefore not available. For a related document, see JC 750 139

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Agricultural Colleges; *College Role; College Teachers; *Educational Objectives; Institutional Research; *Junior Colleges; *Role Perception; *Teacher Attitudes; Technical Institutes; Values
IDENTIFIERS Alfred; IGI; Institutional Goals Inventory; SUNY Agricultural and Technical College

ABSTRACT

As a step toward the development of their 1976 Campus Master Plan, Alfred State College surveyed its academic and non-academic faculty to determine their perceptions of institutional goals and goal priorities. In December 1974, the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) was sent to 335 faculty members; 208 (62 percent) responded. College Council members and the President were also surveyed. The IGI lists 90 statements of possible institutional goals and requests two responses to each statement--an "Is" response and a "Should Be" response. Both Outcome Goals and Process Goals, select factors which may influence the realization of the Outcome Goals, are considered. The faculty perceived only two Outcome Goals (Vocational Preparation and Academic Development) and one Process Goal (Accountability/Efficiency) as being currently afforded slightly greater than medium importance. All other goal areas were perceived as being currently afforded only medium or less than medium importance. Each "Should Be" score was higher than its corresponding "Is" score; however, the "Is" and "Should Be" profiles were generally similar, suggesting perceived and desired priority structures which do not differ radically. On the basis of survey results, a goal priority structure is recommended. (DC)

ED101784

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS:

SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared by:

Richard G. Dumont, Ph.D.
Director of Institutional Research
State University of New York
Agricultural and Technical College
Alfred, New York

February, 1975

JC 750 138

Introduction

This is a summary report on a survey of campus goals conducted at the State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College at Alfred, New York during the month of December, 1974. With the approval and encouragement of the President of the College and with the advice and assistance of the Director of Institutional Research, the College's Long Range Planning Committee concurred that an integral part of the development of the 1976 Campus Master Plan should consist in a survey of the faculty for the purpose of identifying goals and goal priorities. The goals and goal priorities identified through the survey should in turn be used to give direction to and to help justify the more specific and "operationally defined" objectives of the College's various organizational units and programs.

The Institutional Goals Inventory

The survey instrument selected for this study was the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI), developed and distributed by the Educational Testing Service in connection with the Service's Institutional Research Program for Higher Education. The Educational Testing Service reports that between May, 1972 and August, 1974 well over two-hundred schools representing thirty-four states and Canada had used the IGI.

The Institutional Goals Inventory is a standardized paper and pencil questionnaire consisting of 90 statements of possible institutional goals. Eighty of these are intended to define or measure 20 "goal areas" of 4 goal statements each, while the remaining 10 are considered "miscellaneous." Thirteen of the goal areas constitute "Outcome Goals," while seven are "Process Goals," which have to do primarily with select factors which may influence the realization of the Outcome Goals. Grouped in terms of "Outcome Goals" and "Process Goals," the 20 IGI goal areas are identified and defined as follows:

OUTCOME GOALS

Academic Development - this goal has to do with acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.

Intellectual Orientation - this goal area relates to an attitude about learning and intellectual work. It means familiarity with research and problem solving methods, the ability to snythesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to lifelong learning.

Individual Personal Development - this goal area means identification by students of personal goals and development of means for achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence.

Humanism/Altruism - this goal area reflects a respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.

Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness - this goal area entails a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-Western art, and encouragement of active student participation in artistic activities.

Traditional Religiousness - this goal area is intended to mean a religiousness that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental -- in short, traditional rather than "secular" or "modern."

Vocational Preparation - this goal area means offering specific occupational curriculums (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning.

Advanced Training - this goal area can be most readily understood simply as the availability of postgraduate education. It means developing and maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate school, providing programs in the professions and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas.

Research - this goal area involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, and seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.

Meeting Local Needs - this goal area is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities.

Public Service - this goal area means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

Social Egalitarianism - this goal area has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups and women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

Social Criticism/Activism - this goal area means providing criticisms of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society.

PROCESS GOALS

Freedom - this goal area is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life styles.

Democratic Governance - this goal area means decentralized decision-making arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can all be significantly involved in campus governance; opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them; and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

Community - this goal area is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment - this goal area means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

Innovation - this goal area is defined as a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life; it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations; and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to individualized instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance.

Off-Campus Learning - this goal area includes time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA work, etc.; study on several campuses during undergraduate programs; awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

Accountability/Efficiency - this goal area is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.

In addition to the 80 goal statements defining the above areas and the 10 miscellaneous goal statements, the IGI also has provision for up to 20 extra goal statements, formulated locally and having a content bearing specifically upon matters of special local concern or interest. The local interest goal statements prepared for this survey represent primarily the efforts of the Long-Range Planning Committee.

Individuals being surveyed are requested to respond twice to each of the 90 (or up to 110) goal statements. First, they are asked to indicate their estimation of, "How important is the goal at this institution at the present time?" Secondly, they are also requested to provide an answer to, "In your judgment, how important should the goal be at this institution?" Both the Is and Should Be responses are made in terms of a five-point scale, ranging from a low of 1 "of no importance, or not applicable" to a high of 5 "of extremely high importance." Thus, for each goal statement, a respondent is scored as either 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5. His score for a goal area is simply the average or mean of his scores on the four goal statements defining that goal area. In order to facilitate the reader's understanding of the scoring procedure, a hypothetical response pattern for a single respondent on the Academic Development goal area is presented on the following page. In this particular case, for example, the respondent would be given a score of 3 on the Is portion of goal statement 1 and a 5 on the Should Be.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hypothetical Response Pattern for a Single Respondent on the Academic Development Goal Area.

Goal Statement Number	Goal Statement		*Degree of Goal Importance				
			No 1	Low 2	Medium 3	High 4	Extremely High 5
1	to help students acquire depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline...	IS			X		
		SHOULD BE					X
4	to ensure that students acquire a basic knowlege in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences...	IS		X			
		SHOULD BE				X	
6	to prepare students for advanced academic work, e.g., at a four-year college or graduate or professional school...	IS		X			
		SHOULD BE			X		
9	to hold students throughout the institution to high standards of intellectual performance...	IS			X		
		SHOULD BE					X

*On the IGI Form these levels actually appear as: "of no importance, or not applicable," "of low importance," "of medium importance," of high importance," and "of extremely high importance," respectively.

His Is score for the Academic Development goal area is 2.5 (3+2+2+3/4), while his Should Be score is 4.25. Weighted averages are calculated in a similar manner for each of the 20 goal areas for all respondents or for various subgroups of respondents.

Several useful types of information are derivable from responses to the IGI goal statements, each of which may be determined either for the total sample or for sample subgroups. First, and most obviously, the importance attributed to any goal area is suggested by the average score for that area. For both the Is and Should Be dimensions of any goal area, scores close to 2 and 1 indicate a goal area perceived to be of little or no importance, those around 3 of medium importance, and those approaching 4 and 5 of high or extremely high importance. Second, some notion of present (Is) and hoped for (Should Be) perceived goal priorities is provided through an examination of the ranks occupied by the several goal area scores. Third, an indication of "how far we have to go" in a particular goal area is suggested by the gap (mean difference) that is perceived to exist between the Is and Should Be dimensions. Since such gaps may differ in magnitude, they may also be used as input for the determination of priorities. It may be argued, for example, that both the Should Be scores and the Should Be-Is discrepancies ought to be employed for establishing priorities both among the Outcome and the Process Goals.

Each of the above types of information on goal areas is considered in a subsequent section of this report. A detailed

presentation of the responses to the individual goal statements is not attempted, however. This more specific and specialized information will appear as a supplement to the summary report.

The Sample

The sample for this survey consists of members of both the academic and non-academic faculty at Alfred State College. Although the possibility of drawing a probability sample was entertained originally, it was decided that the most appropriate sampling plan would be one which allowed each and every member of the faculty the opportunity to express his or her opinion. Accordingly, with the exception of the part-time academics at the College's Cattaraugus County Extension and those individuals known to be on leave, copies of the IGI Questionnaire were sent to all members of the faculty. Out of a total of 335 questionnaires distributed, 208 were returned, representing a response rate of 62%.

The table on the following page compares the sample to the sample frame in terms of the representation of the College's major organizational units. Considering the voluntary nature of participation, it is interesting and encouraging to note the similarity in the compositions of the sample frame and the sample. Although some divisions are somewhat overrepresented and some underrepresented, there exists a close correspondence between the two percentage distributions.

In addition to the faculty contribution, it was thought desirable to elicit the goal preferences of the College Council.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sample Frame and Sample Compositions Compared in Terms of the College's Major Organizational Units

Division	Sample Frame # (a)	Sample Frame %**	Sample # (b)	Sample %**	Sample as % of Frame (b/a)x100
Agricultural Technologies	32	9.55	14	6.73	43.75
Arts & Sciences Division	54	16.12	31	14.90	57.41
Business Technologies	37	11.04	26	12.50	70.27
Engineering Technologies	54	16.12	29	13.94	53.70
Health Technologies	39	11.64	26	12.50	66.67
Vocational Division	44	13.13	29	13.94	65.91
Student Affairs Division	32	9.55	23	11.06	71.88
*All Other Faculty	43	12.84	30	14.42	69.77
Totals	335	99.99	208	99.99	62.09

*All Other Faculty: Offices of the President and Vice President, including Business Affairs, Computer Center, Admissions; Office of the Academic Dean, including Educational Communications and Library.

**Percentages do not add to 100, due to rounding.

Of the eleven Council members invited to participate in the survey, seven responded, yielding a rate of return very similar to that of the faculty. Select comparisons involving the goal preferences of Faculty, College Council, and President are made in a subsequent section of this report.

The Survey Procedure

On December 3, 1974 a memorandum from the Director of Institutional Research was distributed to all members of the faculty for the purpose of announcing the upcoming survey and explaining its rationale, especially its relationship to the 1976 Campus Master Plan. On December 9, copies of the IGI Questionnaire were distributed to all faculty members in the sample frame. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter once again explaining the purpose of the survey and noting the use to which the results would be put; and urging participation, "...in a kind of 'grassroots' identification of goals and goal priorities...." Naturally, respondents were also assured that their replies would be treated anonymously. Subsequent to the distribution of the questionnaire, reminders emphasizing the importance of the survey were published serially in Faculty Facts. The last of the 208 questionnaires was received on December 27.

The Data Processing and Analysis

Although the Educational Testing Service provides for the analysis of IGI data, cost considerations made it more attractive to enlist the assistance of our own Computer Center.

Accordingly, all aspects of data preparation and processing were conducted locally. All programs were written and their running supervised by the Director of the Computer Center. The decision to use local facilities for data analysis was justifiable not only on economic grounds, for the services provided, particularly in terms of the analytical versatility of the programs, were far superior to those available on a regular basis through the Educational Testing Service.

The Results of the Goals Survey for the Total Faculty Sample

Organized in terms of Outcome Goals and Process Goals, the Is scores, the Should Be scores, and the Should Be-Is discrepancies for the entire faculty sample are presented in Tables 1a and 1b. A graphic portrayal of these data appears in Figure 1, the "Institutional Goals Inventory Profile Chart," which is intended to facilitate understanding and interpretation.

Focusing first upon the Is scores, it is interesting to note that the faculty perceive of only two Outcome Goals and one Process Goal as being currently afforded slightly greater than "of medium importance." These are the Outcome Goals of Vocational Preparation and Academic Development and the Process Goal of Accountability/Efficiency. All other goal areas are perceived as being currently afforded only medium or less than medium importance. The least important Process Goal is apparently Off-Campus Learning, while Research, Advanced Training, and Traditional Religiousness constitute the least important Outcome Goals.

Although the magnitude of the Is scores may be disappointing to some, the Is Profile is not surprising, for it appears to capture quite well the mission of the two-year Agricultural and Technical College.

Shifting our attention to the Should Be scores and Profile, our first important observation is that each and every Should Be score is higher than its corresponding Is score. This phenomenon may be interpreted as indicative of a degree of non-complacency among the faculty, which is probably in the best interest of any

institution in the long run. Also noteworthy is the overall similarity of the Is and Should Be Profiles, suggestive of present and hoped for perceived priority structures which do not differ radically.

Examining the Should Be Profile in somewhat greater detail, we observe that three Outcome Goals have scores falling unambiguously into the region of high importance, Vocational Preparation, Individual Personal Development, and Intellectual Orientation. Medium to high importance is attributed to the goal areas of Academic Development, Meeting Local Needs, and Humanism/Altruism. Of approximate medium importance are Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Social Criticism/Activism. Finally, as was true with the Is scores, Research, Advanced Training, and Traditional Religiousness fall into the region of little or no importance.

Among the Process Goals, Community stands out as a goal area which Should Be of high importance at Alfred State College. Furthermore, it is interesting to observe that, with the exception of Off-Campus Learning, all of the remaining Process Goals fall into the region of medium to high importance.

The Should Be-Is discrepancies may also be scrutinized so as to yield interesting and potentially useful information. As we have already noted, these discrepancies are indicative of "how far we have to go" in the various goal areas. Our data, for example, suggest that the Alfred State College faculty perceive that more needs to be done especially in those Outcome Goal areas

of Individual Personal Development, Intellectual Orientation, and Humanism/Altruism; but also with regard to Vocational Preparation, Public Service, Meeting Local Needs, and even Social Criticism/Activism.

Among the Process Goals, we note Should Be-Is discrepancies that are larger on the average than those observed for the Outcome Goals. The largest of these, of course, is the discrepancy appearing in the Community goal area. Notably large discrepancies also appear in the Innovation and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Goal areas. These Process Goal Should Be-Is discrepancies apparently indicate a more or less widespread desire on the part of the faculty for a campus environment which is more innovative and intellectually exciting, and where more trusting, candid, and congenial relations exist among members of the collegiate community.

At this juncture, it is perhaps appropriate to note that Should Be-Is discrepancies of the magnitude reported here are apparently not uncommon. According to data available through the Educational Testing Service, faculty members generally express a longing for higher degrees of Innovation, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, and Community than they perceive as existing currently. The same also appears true of a number of the Outcome Goals, such as Intellectual Orientation, Humanism/Altruism, and Individual Personal Development. It is our conviction that one ought to be wary about pursuing this line of argument too far, however, for the reference to normative data in the context of a campus goals study may lend itself rather readily to an easy justification of the status quo, that is, as providing a convenient

excuse for a do-nothing policy. What we are referring to here, of course, is the complacent attitude which is characterized by the following kind of reasoning: "Well, if things are like this at other schools, why should we try to be any different than anybody else?" In the long run, of course, this kind of attitude can only be self-defeating and a hindrance to healthy institutional adaptation to necessary change.

The Priorities

The setting of goal priorities is a very important part of the planning process, and it is a matter to which we now direct our attention. How may the findings which we have just surveyed be handled so as to suggest goal area priorities for Alfred State College? At least three rational methods present themselves as alternatives. First, it may be argued persuasively that the Should Be Profile ought to be used to set up a list of priorities. According to this procedure, therefore, the various goal areas are ranked in terms of their Should Be scores, with the top ranking areas being those of highest priority. As a second alternative, however, it may be argued that what is critical is not the absolute value of the Should Be scores, but rather the magnitude of the Should Be-Is discrepancies. Here, the Should Be-Is discrepancies are rank ordered, the justification being that we should afford greatest attention to those areas where the gap between the perceived present and hoped for state of affairs is widest, regardless of how relatively desirable (as determined by the first alternative) that hoped for state might be. A third alternative is also

available as a very reasonable compromise, and it is the one to which both the Director of Institutional Research and the Long Range Planning Committee subscribe. Under this procedure, both the Should Be and Should Be-Is discrepancy alternatives are seen as quite sound and therefore both deserving of consideration in priority determination, so that the Should Be score and Should Be-Is discrepancy are summed for each goal area and these sums are subsequently ranked to yield a goal priority listing. Such a goal priority listing for the faculty of Alfred State College is presented in Tables 2a and 2b. Since Outcome Goals and Process Goals are seen to constitute fundamentally different entities, separate rank orders have been prepared for each set.

A careful examination of the "Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy" column of Tables 2a and 2b reveals a number of natural breaks or gaps between adjacent goal areas. These gaps assume considerable importance here, for they may be used to define operationally groups or clusters of goal areas, reflecting varying degrees of importance. Of course, the existence and use of such natural breaks or gaps is preferable to and more easily justified than is an imposition of an entirely arbitrary division of goal areas into regions of very high, high, medium, low, and very low priority.

Among the Outcome Goal areas, our data show the largest natural breaks occurring between Intellectual Orientation and Humanism/Altruism, between Academic Development and Public Service, and between Social Criticism/Activism and Research. Among the Process Goal areas, the largest gaps appear between Community and

and Innovation, between Accountability/Efficiency and Freedom, and between Freedom and Off-Campus Learning.

In accord with the immediately preceding considerations, therefore, a particular goal priority structure for Alfred State College emerges. Specifically, the following are offered as recommendations:

1.a That VERY HIGH priority be afforded the Outcome Goals of Individual Personal Development, Vocational Preparation, and Intellectual Orientation.

1.b That HIGH priority be afforded the Outcome Goals of Humanism/Altruism, Meeting Local Needs, and Academic Development.

1.c That MEDIUM priority be afforded the Outcome Goals of Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness, and Social Criticism/Activism.

1.d That LOW priority be afforded the Outcome Goals of Research, Traditional Religiousness, and Advanced Training.

2.a That VERY HIGH priority be afforded the Process Goal of Community.

2.b That HIGH priority be afforded the Process Goals of Innovation, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Democratic Governance, and Accountability/Efficiency.

2.c That MEDIUM priority be afforded the Process Goal of Freedom.

2.d That LOW priority be afforded the Process Goal of Off-Campus Learning.

To the extent that the above recommendations are accepted as providing a reasonable and justifiable goal priority structure for Alfred State College, they ought to play a significant role in guiding the development of the 1976 Campus Master Plan, both for the College as a whole and for its various organizational units. Furthermore, the more specific and "operationally formulated" objectives of the College and its units should be justifiable in terms of their compatibility with the faculty-defined goal

priority structure. That is, if a broad-based and carefully-conducted faculty survey of campus goals is to be more than an interesting academic exercise, then those divisions, departments, offices, and individuals charged with planning responsibilities should be held accountable for taking the results of that survey into account.

The Issue of Consensus About the Goal Priority Structure

At this point, an important question may be raised concerning the matter of agreement about the priority recommendations of the preceding section. The reader is reminded that the priority structure emerges from the combined responses of all 208 participating faculty members, and that as a summarization of those data it may be masking a great deal of variability among identifiable and significant sample subgroups. Perhaps academics have a very different sense of priorities than do administrators, who may in turn differ dramatically from student affairs professionals. What about the matter of consensus among the academic divisions? Are their goal priority structures compatible? How does the President's goal preference structure compare with that of the Faculty? And what of the College Council? How do their aspirations for Alfred State College compare with those of the President and the Faculty?

The data of Tables 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b shed light upon each of the above questions. Table 3a compares the Outcome Goal priorities of Academic Faculty, Administrators, Student Affairs Staff, Other Faculty, College Council, and President with one another and with the priorities established by the Faculty as a

whole as a standard. The most striking feature of these data is the amount of consensus revealed overall, especially within the four major priority levels of Very High, High, Medium, and Low Priority. There is absolutely no disagreement among the various subgroups about what should constitute the top three and the bottom three goal areas. Although some variability of rank occurs within the Very High and within the Low categories (for example, Academic Faculty afford the highest rank to Intellectual Orientation, Administrators to Vocational Preparation, and Student Affairs Staff to Individual Personal Development), the convergence of the top ranks and of the bottom ranks is more striking and more important than the minimal divergences which occur. Between the regions of High and Medium Priority three reversals may be observed, but these must be judged as insignificant when weighed against the remarkable degree of consensus revealed in these data. It is particularly interesting and encouraging to note the amount of agreement occurring among the Total Faculty Sample, the College Council, and the President.

Table 3b compares the priority structures of the same subgroups for the Process Goal areas, and once again a high degree of agreement is to be observed. One exception to this pattern exists, however, and it is worthy of comment. Specifically, the College Council differs from the Total Faculty Sample in affording top priority to the Process Goal of Accountability/Efficiency. Of course, this particular divergence is not surprising. Neither is it startling to discover that the President and the Administrators show themselves as being somewhere "in between" the Total Faculty Sample and the College Council on the Accountability/

Efficiency issue.

Tables 4a and 4b depict the priority structures of the six academic divisions for the Outcome Goals and the Process Goals, respectively. Although very similar priority structures are again revealed, it is interesting to observe that the notable divergences occurring among the Outcome Goals are concentrated in two subgroups, Arts and Sciences and the Vocational Division. In terms of their academic function, these divisions differ somewhat from the remaining four and, more significantly, from one another. Certain aspects of their respective priority structures appear to capture quite well certain differences in their educational missions, differences which are commonly understood. For example, Arts and Sciences would de-emphasize Vocational Preparation and would give greater emphasis to Academic Development and Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness; and, while being the only academic subgroup to afford top priority to Vocational Preparation, the Vocational Division also displays a unique aspect of its mission by de-emphasizing Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness.

The Local Goal Statements

As was noted in a previous section of this report, the Institutional Goals Inventory provides for up to 20 additional goal statements, formulated by local researchers and allowing investigation of matters of special local concern or interest. Listed in order of the "Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy," and organized into recommended priority level clusters, the Local Goal Statements for Alfred State College appear below. Table 5 displays supplementary and supporting data, showing

the Is Score, the Should Be Score, the Should Be-Is Discrepancy, and the Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy.

Although not presented in the form of a series of detailed tables here, a comparison of rankings among the sample subgroups of the preceding section shows substantial variation in rank within but little variation between the High and Medium priority levels.

LOCAL GOAL STATEMENTS

Very High Priority

94. to develop and maintain educational programs that offer career flexibility in anticipation of technological change

High Priority

97. to mobilize the resources of alumni to aid in student recruitment and placement

102. to help students develop an awareness and appreciation of the so-called "core American values" (for example, the virtues of democracy, respect for the rights of the individual, cooperation, honesty, humanitarianism, etc.)

91. to establish a permanent campus for the Vocational Division in Wellsville

109. to help students develop an awareness of and desire to apply the courtesies and manners appropriate to a variety of social situations

98. to grant college credit for faculty-approved non-traditional courses, such as training programs which might be offered by private and public employers

107. to make available to surrounding communities the technical expertise of the College (through specialized off-campus courses, faculty consulting, and the like)

99. to encourage the participation of senior citizens in the various programs offered by the College (recreational, cultural, academic, counseling)

101. to offer specialized short-courses in response to the needs of interested members of the community

104. to develop cooperative education programs, that is, those involving a coordinated program of both on-the-job and classroom experience

Medium Priority

92. to engage in faculty exchange programs with other colleges and universities

93. to foster an atmosphere of intellectual exchange among the Alfred State College faculty through presentation of papers, debates, panel discussions, and the like

105. to involve faculty in the active recruitment of new students

95. to offer college credit courses for senior high school students

96. to engage in student exchange programs with other colleges and universities

100. to engage in faculty exchange programs with minority colleges and universities

110. to engage in international faculty exchange programs

103. to increase the heterogeneity of the student body through the active recruitment of members of minority ethnic, racial, and religious groups

106. to engage in student exchange programs with minority colleges and universities

108. to increase the heterogeneity of the faculty through the active recruitment of members of minority ethnic, racial, and religious groups

The IGI "Miscellaneous" Goal Statements

It will be recalled from a previous section that the Institutional Goals Inventory contains 10 goal statements which are not included in the measurement of the Outcome and Process Goal areas. Since a number of these bear upon issues of rather obvious importance, we list them below ranked in terms of the "Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy,"

and grouped into recommended priority clusters. The interested reader is referred to Table 6 for relevant supporting data.

IGI "MISCELLANEOUS" GOAL STATEMENTS

Very High Priority

12. to ensure that students who graduate have achieved some level of reading, writing, and mathematics competency...

High Priority

84. to be organized for continuous short-, medium-, and long-range planning for the total institution...

88. to create a climate in which systematic evaluation of college programs is accepted as an institutional way of life...

80. to maintain or work to achieve a reputable standing for the institution within the academic world (or in relation to similar colleges)...

90. to achieve consensus among people on the campus about the goals of the institution...

Medium Priority

89. to systematically interpret the nature, purpose, and work of the institution to citizens off the campus...

85. to include local citizens in planning college programs that will affect the local community...

82. to carry on a broad and vigorous program of extra-curricular activities and events for students...

71. to maintain or work to achieve a large degree of institutional autonomy or independence in relation to governmental or other educational agencies...

86. to excel in intercollegiate athletic competition...

Additional Information

Additional and more detailed information on the Survey of Institutional Goals is available through the Office of Institutional Research.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1a: Scores of the Alfred State College Faculty Sample (N=208) on the Institutional Goals Inventory Outcome Goals.

Outcome Goal	Is Score	Should Be Score	Should Be-Is Discrepancy
Academic Development	3.13	3.65	.515
Intellectual Orientation	2.78	3.93	1.148
Individual Personal Development	2.83	4.01	1.187
Humanism/Altruism	2.26	3.31	1.053
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.27	2.85	.586
Traditional Religiousness	1.39	1.70	.315
Vocational Preparation	3.38	4.28	.902
Advanced Training	1.41	1.60	.189
Research	1.54	1.88	.336
Meeting Local Needs	2.80	3.51	.711
Public Service	2.27	3.00	.732
Social Egalitarianism	2.54	3.05	.513
Social Criticism/ Activism	2.01	2.61	.605

Table 1b: Scores of the Alfred State College Faculty Sample (N=208) on the Institutional Goals Inventory Process Goals.

Process Goal	Is Score	Should Be Score	Should Be-Is Discrepancy
Freedom	2.94	3.33	.387
Democratic Governance	3.04	3.70	.659
Community	3.00	4.18	1.179
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.75	3.56	.817
Innovation	2.68	3.61	.927
Off-Campus Learning	1.89	2.60	.708
Accountability/ Efficiency	3.11	3.63	.515

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

~~PAGE(S)~~ _____ WAS (~~WERE~~) ~~MISSING~~ (REMOVED) FROM
THIS DOCUMENT PRIOR TO ITS BEING SUBMITTED TO
THE ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2a: Outcome Goal Priorities for Alfred State College Based Upon Both the Should Be Profile and the Should Be-Is Discrepancies.

Outcome Goal	Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy	Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy Rank
Individual Personal Development	5.20	1
Vocational Preparation	5.19	2
Intellectual Orientation	5.08	3
Humanism/Altruism	4.37	4
Meeting Local Needs	4.22	5
Academic Development	4.16	6
Public Service	3.73	7
Social Egalitarianism	3.56	8
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	3.44	9
Social Criticism/ Activism	3.22	10
Research	2.22	11
Traditional Religiousness	2.02	12
Advanced Training	1.79	13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2b: Process Goal Priorities for Alfred State College Based Upon Both the Should Be Profile and the Should Be-Is Discrepancies.

Process Goal	Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy	Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy Rank
Community	5.36	1
Innovation	4.53	2
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	4.38	3
Democratic Governance	4.36	4
Accountability/ Efficiency	4.14	5
Freedom	3.71	6
Off-Campus Learning	3.31	7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3a: Outcome Goal Priorities for Alfred State College--Comparisons among the Total Faculty Sample, Academic Faculty, Administrators, Student Affairs Staff, Other Faculty, College Council, and President.

PRIORITY LEVEL	Outcome Goal	Outcome Goal Priority Rank Based Upon Both the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy						
		Total Sample (N=208)	Academic Faculty (N=133)	Administrators (N=28)	Student Affairs (N=23)	Other Faculty (N=23)	College Council (N=7)	President (N=1)
Very High	Individual Personal Development	1	3	2	1	2	2	2
	Vocational Preparation	2	2	1	2	1	3	1
	Intellectual Orientation	3	1	3	3	3	1	3
High	Humanism/Altruism	4	5	4	4	4	6	4
	Meeting Local Needs	5	6	5	5	5	5	5
	Academic Development	6	4	6	10	7	4	9
Medium	Public Service	7	7	8	6	6	9	7
	Social Egalitarianism	8	8	7	8	9	7	7
	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	9	9	9	9	10	8	10
	Social Criticism/Activism	10	10	10	7	8	10	7
Low	Research	11	11	12	11	12	11	12
	Traditional Religiousness	12	12	11	13	13	12	12
	Advanced Training	13	13	13	12	11	13	12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3b: Process Goal Priorities for Alfred State College--Comparisons among the Total Faculty Sample, Academic Faculty, Administrators, Student Affairs Staff, Other Faculty, College Council, and President.

PRIORITY LEVEL	Process Goal	Process Goal Priority Rank Based Upon Both the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy						
		Total Sample (N=208)	Academic Faculty (N=133)	Administrators (N=28)	Student Affairs (N=23)	Other Faculty (N=23)	College Council (N=7)	President (N=1)
Very High	Community	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
High	Innovation	2	2	3	2	2	3	2.5
High	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	3	4	4	4	5	4	4
High	Democratic Governance	4	3	5	3	3	5	5
High	Accountability/Efficiency	5	5	2	6	4	1	2.5
Medium	Freedom	6	6	6	5	6	7	6
Low	Off-Campus Learning	7	7	7	7	7	6	7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4a: Outcome Goal Priorities for Alfred State College--Comparisons among the Total Faculty Sample and the Six Academic Divisions.

PRIORITY LEVEL	Outcome Goal	Outcome Goal Priority Rank Based Upon Both the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy						
		Total Sample (N=208)	Ag. Tech. (N=14)	Arts & Sciences (N=31)	Bus. Tech. (N=26)	Eng. Tech. (N=29)	Health Tech. (N=26)	Voca. Div. (N=29)
Very High	Individual Personal Development	1	2	2	1	2	1	2
	Vocational Preparation	2	3	4	2	3	3	1
	Intellectual Orientation	3	1	1	3	1	2	3
High	Humanism/Altruism	4	5	5	4	5	5	5
	Meeting Local Needs	5	6	7	5	6	6	4
	Academic Development	6	4	3	6	4	4	7
Medium	Public Service	7	7	9	8	7	7	6
	Social Egalitarianism	8	9	8	7	9	10	8
	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	9	8	6	10	8	8	13
	Social Criticism/Activism	10	10	10	9	10	9	10
Low	Research	11	13	11	11	11	11	11
	Traditional Religiousness	12	11	12	12	13	12	9
	Advanced Training	13	12	13	13	12	13	12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4b: Process Goal Priorities for Alfred State College--Comparisons among the Total Faculty Sample and the Six Academic Divisions.

PRIORITY LEVEL	Process Goal	Process Goal Priority Rank Based Upon Both the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy						
		Total Sample (N=208)	Ag. Tech. (N=14)	Arts & Sciences (N=31)	Bus. Tech. (N=26)	Eng. Tech. (N=29)	Health Tech. (N=26)	Voca. Div. (N=29)
Very High	Community	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
High	Innovation	2	3	3	3	2	3	5
High	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	3	2	2	5	3	4	4
High	Democratic Governance	4	6	4	2	5	2	3
High	Accountability/Efficiency	5	4	6	4	4	6	2
Medium	Freedom	6	5	5	6	6	5	7
Low	Off-Campus Learning	7	7	7	7	7	7	6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5. Scores of the Alfred State College Faculty Sample (N=208) on the Institutional Goals Inventory Local Goal Statements.

Statement Number	Is Score	Should Be Score	Should Be-Is Discrepancy	Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy	Priority Rank
91.	3.23	4.02	.79	4.81	4.5
92.	2.11	3.23	1.12	4.35	11
93.	1.90	3.05	1.15	4.20	12
94.	3.11	4.27	1.16	5.43	1
95.	2.08	3.02	.94	3.96	14
96.	1.95	2.82	.87	3.69	15
97.	2.36	3.66	1.30	4.96	2
98.	2.00	3.34	1.34	4.68	6
99.	2.13	3.36	1.23	4.59	8
100.	1.71	2.67	.96	3.63	16
101.	2.40	3.49	1.09	4.58	9
102.	2.51	3.68	1.17	4.85	3
103.	2.34	2.78	.44	3.22	18
104.	2.61	3.56	.95	4.51	10
105.	2.21	3.13	.92	4.05	13
106.	1.73	2.46	.73	3.19	19
107.	2.53	3.60	1.07	4.67	7
108.	2.18	2.58	.40	2.98	20
109.	2.21	3.51	1.30	4.81	4.5
110.	1.77	2.65	.88	3.53	17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6: Scores of the Alfred State College Faculty Sample (N=208) on the Institutional Goals Inventory "Miscellaneous" Goal Statements.

Statement Number	Is Score	Should Be Score	Should Be-Is Discrepancy	Sum of the Should Be Score and the Should Be-Is Discrepancy	Priority Rank
12.	3.14	4.21	1.07	5.28	1
71.	2.41	2.91	.50	3.41	9
80.	3.69	4.19	.50	4.69	4
82.	3.42	3.50	.08	3.58	8
84.	3.16	3.98	.82	4.80	2
85.	2.53	3.22	.69	3.91	7
86.	2.87	2.49	-.38	2.11	10
88.	2.85	3.79	.94	4.73	3
89.	2.73	3.44	.71	4.15	6
90.	2.82	3.62	.80	4.42	5

*Selected References

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Testing Service, Colleges and Universities Administering The Institutional Goals Inventory May 1972-August 1974, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1974.

Educational Testing Service, Goals for California Higher Education: Summary of A Report, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

L. James Harvey, Management by Objectives in Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: McManis Associates, Inc., 1974.

Robert A. Huff, Inventory of Educational Outcomes and Activities, Preliminary Draft, Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS at WICHE, 1971.

Ben Lawrence, George Weathersby, and Virginia W. Patterson (eds.), Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement, and Evaluation, Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Sidney S. Micek and William Ray Arney, Outcome-Oriented Planning in Higher Education: An Approach or An Impossibility?, Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS at WICHE, 1973.

Sidney S. Micek and Robert A. Wallhaus, An Introduction to the Identification and Uses of Higher Education Outcome Information, Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS at WICHE, 1973.

Richard E. Peterson, College Goals and the Challenge of Effectiveness, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Richard E. Peterson, The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Richard E. Peterson, Toward Institutional Goal-Consciousness, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 07 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

*Available in the Office of Institutional Research.